

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/895,152 07/02/2001 David R. Brown 2119-0160P 9526 12/02/2004 EXAMINER Patent Administrator CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH Mems Optical, Inc. 205 Import Circle, Suite 2 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER Huntsville, AL 35806

1756 DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/895,152	BROWN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daborah Chacko-Davis	1756
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.		
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:		
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or		
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 		
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: none.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-25,27,28 and 36-42</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:		
	_	OHN A. MCPHERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: i) Of the reasons set for the in the final rejection, i Applicants' argument that Mazed is silent with regard to multiple passes where each pass is offset such that no two passes write along th same path has been addressed in argument A of the final rejection, and iii) Applicants' argue that the application states "one technique fo maximizing averaging effect is to purposely shift each pass by some vary small distance or offset such that no two passes write along the same path" and that Mazed suggests no such offset. See argument A, and Mazed teaches multiple passes that are offset (see figure 3C references 130a-1, 130a-2, etc). Additionally, in regards to the statement from the application, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.